

Phraseological profiles of legislative genres: complex prepositions as a special case of legal phrasemes in EU law and national law

Łucja Biel

Abstract The paper explores the hypothesis that a large proportion of non-terminological word combinations in legislation is built around complex prepositions, which significantly contribute to phraseological profiles of legislative genres. The paper analyses the distribution and functions of complex prepositions in multilingual EU law and national law, on a comparative (cross-systemic) and contrastive English-Polish basis, against the background of general language. The analysis is conducted in the corpus-based methodology with the corpora of EU legislation (JRC Acquis) – regulations and directives, national legislation of the UK (BoLC) and of Poland (PLC), and general corpora (BNC and NKJP). The findings confirm that complex prepositions are very frequent and hence cognitively salient in the genre of legislation: complex prepositions show increased distribution against general language, in particular in Polish. It is demonstrated that national legislation and EU legislation (translationese) are profiled by different sets of salient prepositions, which may adversely affect the readability of the latter due to interference. Functionally, it has been demonstrated that the phraseological profiles of legislative instruments are marked by complex prepositions used predominantly in referencing patterns (authority, conflict), conditionals, anchoring (framing) patterns, defining patterns and time deixis.

Keywords complex prepositions, legal phrasemes, EU law, EU translation, legislative genre, phraseological profile

1 Introduction: Legal phraseology

With the advent of corpus linguistics and its focus on patterns, phraseology has received a second life. It is now studied mainly in the frequency-based approach which has redefined the concept of phraseology as a broad category that includes collocations, multi-word lexical units and lexical bundles (cf. Granger/Paquot 2008: 28–32), which are more frequent and cognitively salient in specialised languages than idioms or proverbs, which traditionally were at the core of phraseological studies (cf. Granger/Paquot 2008: 28). The phraseology of specialised languages has also benefited from corpus-based advances within Terminology, which has extended its area of interest by the linguistic environment of terms, that is phrasemes. Yet legal phraseology has not attracted much attention due to the predominant terminological orientation of legal language studies. Notable exceptions include Kjær's pioneering paper (1990), Goźdz-Roszkowski's work on multi-word patterns across legal genres (2011), Pontrandolfo's contrastive study of phraseology in criminal judgments (2013) and Biel's study of phrasemes in translated and nontranslated law (2014a, 2014b).

Legal genres have conventionalised their own phraseological profiles (cf. Groom qtd. in Goźdz-Roszkowski 2011: 39) and it may be hypothesised that such profiles are distinct not only externally, across legal genres, but also internally, within a legal genre. This paper will analyse an internal variation of prepositional phrases within the genre of legislation. One of the distinguishing features of legal phraseology is that it may contain very long sequences,

ranging from phrases to entire clauses. Secondly, in addition to multi-word terms and their collocations which are central to legal language, some significant combinations do not contain terms. This has also been confirmed *inter alia*, by Goźdź-Roszkowski (2011: 107), who has found that a large number of keywords in US legal texts are not terms proper but patterns which “fulfil very important local functions”.

Drawing on earlier studies, Biel (2014a: 36–48) has proposed the phraseological continuum in the language of the law which accounts for non-terminological categories that are statistically significant in the genre of legislation. They range from the global textual level to the local microlevel: text-organising, grammatical and term-forming patterns as well as term-embedding and lexical collocations. The last group covers frequent recurrent patterns and standard phrases at the microstructural level which do not contain terms, for example qualifications of legal rules and inter-/intratextual mapping patterns, e.g. *in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 25(2)*.

It is hypothesised in this paper that a large proportion of such unique non-terminological word combinations in legislation is built around prepositions, in particular complex prepositions. This was suggested by my earlier study (Biel 2014a), where keywords revealed an untypically high, asymmetrical distribution of prepositions in EU and Polish legislation (which was not researched further in the previous project). The objective of this paper is to analyse the distribution and functions of complex prepositions in multilingual EU legislation, in its English and Polish version, and in national legislation against the background of general language. Given the multifarious nature of EU law, which is heavily based on translation and cross-linguistic negotiations of meaning, both a comparative and contrastive perspective will be adopted. The comparative (cross-systemic) perspective will juxtapose prepositions across legal systems by comparing multilingual legislation to national legislation in the same language, while the contrastive (cross-linguistic) perspective will juxtapose prepositions across legal languages by comparing their distribution in legal English and legal Polish. Thus, the analysis will cover both nontranslations and translations to answer the following research questions:

- 1) How and why does the distribution of complex prepositions differ in legal and nonlegal language, and in nontranslations and translations?
- 2) What functions do complex prepositions serve in the legislative genre?

2 Complex prepositions as a distinctive feature of legal discourse

In this section, I outline the definitions and categorisations of prepositions in order to set the scene for complex prepositions. Then I review the literature on the role of complex prepositions in legal language.

2.1 Prepositions as a word class

Prepositions constitute a closed system of noninflectional function words, the main function of which is to link units and encode the *relationship* between them (cf. Greenbaum/Quirk 1990: 188, Biber et al. 2007: 56). Prepositions are divided into simple and complex:

- 1) **simple prepositions:** (a) monosyllabic, e.g. *in*, *on*, which are typically very frequent, unstressed and with a reduced vowel; (b) polysyllabic: derived from a combination of simple prepositions (*within*), participles (*during*), borrowings (*despite*) (Greenbaum/Quirk 1990: 190);

- 2) **complex prepositions:** they are defined as “multi-word sequences [that] function semantically and syntactically as single prepositions” (Biber et al. 2007: 75); in English they range from two to four words (*save for, in exchange for, as a result of*). They may be further divided into: (a) a combination of a simple preposition with a preceding participle, adjective, adverb, or conjunction, e.g. *owing to, devoid of*; (b) a simple preposition followed by a noun and another simple preposition: *in charge of* (Greenbaum/Quirk 1990: 190). Complex prepositions arose from productive prepositional constructions through the process of lexicalisation (cf. Huddleston 1986: 342); hence, the boundary between a complex preposition and a prepositional phrase is fuzzy in some cases.

Classifications of Polish prepositions are based on similar criteria although polysyllabic simple prepositions tend to be distinguished as a separate class: (1) **simple prepositions**, e.g. *w, na*; (2) **compound prepositions** (“przyimek złożony”) which are polysyllabic, e.g. *ponad, zza*; and (3) **complex prepositions** (“przyimek wtórny”, lit. secondary preposition), e.g. *na skutek* (cf. Milewska 2003: 35–39 for further discussion).

Prepositions overlap with other word classes: they may function as subordinators, adverbs, adjectives, and infinitive markers (*to*) in English (Biber et al. 2007: 76–77). While in traditional approaches the status of complex prepositions is not always clear (a phraseme? a preposition?), the frequency-based approach views them as a type of a phraseme, a recurrent sequence of words. It should be noted that complex prepositions are often embedded in longer phrasemes.

2.2 Complex prepositions as a distinctive feature of legal language

Complex prepositions are considered to be a distinctive feature of legal language both in the written and spoken mode: this feature has been confirmed at least for English (Quirk et al. 1985: 672, Johnson/Coulthard 2010: 11), Polish (Łapa 2006), Spanish and Italian (Pontrandolfo 2013). Their distinctiveness in legal language results from their increased frequency, that is overrepresentation, compared to everyday language. Some complex prepositions may be restricted mainly to legal and administrative language (cf. Quirk et al. for “legalistic or bureaucratic usage” [1985: 672], Charrow/Charrow on vague *as to* [1979: 1322]). The overrepresentation of complex prepositions may be attributed to their syntactic and semantic functions. First, since prepositions introduce noun phrases, their frequent use results in nominalisations and contributes to a more formal style. In the same vein, Alcaraz and Hughes (2002: 9) observe that high-frequency prepositional phrases – and they list mainly complex prepositions such as *pursuant to, without prejudice to, subject to* – create an “archaic or solemn tone”. At the semantic level, complex prepositions – as Johnson and Coulthard (2010: 11) note – code more precise meanings than simple prepositions and hence may help reduce vagueness (see also Milewska 2003: 28, Łapa 2006: 359). The disambiguating function is stressed, *inter alia*, by Bhatia (1994: 143), who sees complex prepositions, such as *in accordance with, in pursuance of*, as a device used to achieve clarity in legislative writing.

The overrepresentation of prepositions in legal discourse tends to be assessed as overuse. Not only complex prepositions but also prepositions *per se* tend to be evaluated negatively by proponents of the Plain English Movement. Take for example Garner (2002), who argues that prepositions may “take over” the sentence: “Sentences larded with prepositions signal that you’re trying to pack in too much information. Readers of legal prose often find themselves

unable to get any air as they're sucked into verbal quicksand" (Garner 2002: 68). Likewise, Schiess (2007) emphasises that the abundance of prepositional phrases results in a "stilted and choppy" and "awkward" style that is "hard to read and hard to read quickly". On the other hand, Garner (2002: 69) warns against the other extreme – the avoidance of prepositions which results in "noun plague" and reduces clarity. It is because without a preposition, the relationship between units being linked is coded implicitly and implicitness invites ambiguity.

Despite their prominence in legal discourse, complex prepositions have not received much attention from scholars, except for a few passing mentions and anecdotal evidence. As Johnson and Coulthard (2010: 11) confirm "as yet there is no systematic comparative study of their use [...] across both modes [i. e. spoken and written mode] and in large corpora". The goal of this paper is to partly fill in this gap by a corpus-based study of complex prepositions within the genre of legislation and by including translation as well.

3 Multilingual EU law – hybrid translator-mediated communication

While both UK and Polish national law is drafted in a monolingual setting, EU law is a melting pot for national legal systems, languages, and cultures and is drafted in a multilingual environment. EU-wide legislation is adopted in 24 official languages and is applicable in 28 Member States. In the case of EU law, the critical determinant of translation quality is its uniform interpretation and application in all the Member States (cf. Šarčević 1997: 73). Under the principles of multilingualism and equal authenticity, all language versions have an authoritative status, that is they are equally valid and presumed to have the same meaning (Šarčević 1997: 64). Furthermore, unlike in typical translation situations, drafting and translation of EU legislation take place concurrently. Although the proposal for a legal instrument is drafted mainly in English, it is then translated into the other official languages; hence, translation is involved at all stages of the drafting process rather than at the final stage only. The process is therefore multistage and multilingual with EU law emerging as a result of translator-mediated institutionally-standardised communication. All these constraints inevitably take a toll on the language of EU law – conceptually, lexically, grammatically and stylistically, creating a hybrid construct.

The hybrid language of multilingual EU law has not been researched extensively (cf. Biel 2014a: 75–83 for an overview) and we still do not have sufficient empirical data on how it differs from national languages of law. This paper will investigate salient prepositional phrases – to what extent they differ, why they differ and whether such differences are justified.

4 Corpus design and methods

This study is a follow-up on the Eurofog project (Biel 2014a) and uses the comparable corpora used in it: the JRC Acquis Corpus of translated EU law and the Polish Law corpus of nontranslated national legislation.

The Regulations Corpus (R-Acquis) and the Directives Corpus (L-Acquis) were extracted in English and Polish from Version 3.0 of the JRC Acquis Corpus released in 2007 (cf. Steinberger et al. 2006). Resolutions, which have general application, are binding in their entirety and are directly applicable in all the Member States, while directives are binding as to the result to be achieved upon each Member State to which they are addressed, but leave the choice of form and methods to national authorities (Article 249 EC Treaty).

The Polish Law Corpus (PLC) was compiled by the author and contains nontranslated Polish legislation in force as at 1 August 2011, covering the period from 1930s to 2011 (although nearly all statutes were substantially amended in the last two decades after the fall of Communism and accession to the EU in 2004). It covers the full range of variability of primary legislation passed by the Polish Parliament, that is the Constitution and various acts of parliament known as *ustawa*. The PLC corpus covers 71 % of the population of the Polish acts of parliament at the cut-off date (cf. Biel 2014a for more details).

Another reference corpus is the balanced sample of the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP; www.nkjp.pl). It is a large reference corpus of contemporary Polish released in 2012 with the time depth of 1945–2011. It is used as a background for the interpretation of translation data and to avoid the “difference mindset” (cf. Baker 2010: 153).

The corpus design for English mirrors that for Polish with two reference corpora. The subcorpus of Acts of Parliament, which is part of the Bononia Legal Corpus (BoLC; http://corpora.dslo.unibo.it/bolc_eng.html), was used as a corpus of national legislation. It contains 238 UK statutes from 1996–2003¹. The British National Corpus, version BNCWeb at Lancaster University (<http://bncweb.lancs.ac.uk/>), was used as a general corpus with a representative cross-section of contemporary British English. For ease of reference, I will refer to it as “general English” and to the corresponding cross-section of the National Corpus of Polish as “general Polish”.

The national corpora are not fully comparable as regards their time span and genre structure;² this is unavoidable due to the culture-specific nature of representativeness which is often based on national readership figures. This is a methodological constraint; however, since these corpora are to serve as a background for the analysis, I am more interested in general trends rather than in absolute figures.

Tab. 1: Study design

Name of the corpus	Texts	Time depth	Tokens/words (million)
POLISH CORPORA			
PL JRC Acquis: Regulations (R-Acquis)	8,821	1958–2006	14.7
PL JRC Acquis: Directives (L-Acquis)	1,962	1958–2006	7.2
Polish Law Corpus (PLC)	755	1930s–2011	6.8
The National Corpus of Polish (NKJP)	n.d.	1945–2011	240.2
ENGLISH CORPORA			
EN JRC Acquis: Regulations (R-Acquis)	8,829	1958–2006	15.8
EN JRC Acquis: Directives (L-Acquis)	1,969	1958–2006	8.8
The Bononia Legal Corpus (BoLC): Acts of Parliament	238	1996–2003	12.9
The British National Corpus: BNCWeb	4,048	1960s–1990s	98.3

Owing to the different sizes of the corpora, frequencies were normalised to 1 million words. The study was conducted with Wordsmith Tools 6.0.

¹ Personal communication with Fabio Tamburini, 5.02.2015.

² E.g. BNC has much more books and fewer periodicals than NKJP.

5 A corpus-based study of distribution of prepositions across legislative genres

5.1 Distribution of simple and complex prepositions in UK legal English, EU legal English, and general English

The discussion will start with a brief overview of the frequency of **simple prepositions** in legal and nonlegal English. Simple prepositions have high frequency and most of them appear in the first 200 words of wordlists. Table 2 shows the frequency of top prepositions in UK legal, EU legal and general English. The frequencies reflect occurrences of a form both as a simple preposition and as part of a complex preposition.

Tab. 2: Frequency of simple prepositions in legal and nonlegal English (normalised to 1 million words)

	UK Legislation BoLC	EU Legislation EN Acquis				General English BNC
		EU Regulations		EU Directives		
<i>of</i>	29,016	46,302 ³	#2 ⁴	46584	#2	30,946
<i>to</i>	23,741	23,747	#4	25720	#3	26,382
<i>in</i>	15,576	25,863	#3	23906	#4	19,711
<i>for</i>	10,882	14,513	#6	11920	#8	8,938
<i>by</i>	8,140	8,467	#13	8006	#11	5,210
<i>under</i>	5,392	1,919	#50	1593	#61	616
<i>with</i>	3,574	5,374	#20	7720	#12	6,699
<i>on</i>	3,177	7,296	#15	6635	#15	7,420
<i>at</i>	2,662	2,948	#32	3639	#25	5,306
<i>from</i>	1,231	3,839	#25	3,405	#28	4,323
<i>after</i>	1,219	626	#164	843	#122	1,157
<i>within</i>	982	1,456	#70	1,257	#81	463
<i>before</i>	860	515	#213	586	#183	863
<i>into</i>	594	1,688	#59	1,439	#74	1,603
<i>out</i>	480	1,246	#80	1,683	#56	2,002
<i>without</i>	264	576	#188	758	#135	454
<i>during</i>	189	745	#140	604	#172	441
<i>except</i>	185	228	#452	242	#242	103
<i>between</i>	139	990	#104	813	#126	920
<i>up</i>	101	594	#180	700	#145	2,109
<i>down</i>	34	1,788	#53	1,513	#69	936
<i>concerning</i>	17	581	#186	587	#181	34

³ Bolded figures indicate strong overrepresentation compared to the other corpora.

⁴ Figures preceded by # indicate a ranking in the wordlist (available only for the EU corpus).

The table shows marked differences in the frequency of prepositions across the corpora and little similarity between how prepositions are used in EU and UK English. The main similarity concerns the top 5 prepositions which are shared (also with BNC but for the fifth *on*), though their normalised frequencies differ significantly:

- UK legislation *of, to, in, for, by*
- EU legislation (Regulations) *of, in, to, for, by*
- EU legislation (Directives) *of, to, in, for, by*
- General English *of, to, in, for, on*

The fact that *by* has an increased frequency in legal English has also been observed by Coulthard and Johnson (2007: 40) on the corpus of contracts, who explained it by a strong preference for passive constructions.

As for the differences, the Eurolect corpora have ca. 40 % prepositions more than the UK legal corpus (which is surprising and may indicate increased explicitation/analyticity in EU English) and 20 % more than the general English corpus. The most frequent preposition in both legal and nonlegal corpora is *of*, which is two times as frequent as the next top ranking preposition in EU English but the difference is much less pronounced in the other corpora. The top ranking of this preposition is due to its grammatical function of genitive; therefore, its strong overrepresentation in EU English may indicate preference for nominalisations and noun strings. It is worth noting in passing that some English prepositions correspond to more synthetic case inflections (*of* genitive, dative) in inflectional languages (cf. Huddleston 1986: 337, Biber et al. 2007: 74), e.g. in Polish.

In most cases simple prepositions are strongly overrepresented⁵ in the Eurolect compared to the UK legal corpus, e.g. *of, in, with, on, from, out, down, into, within, between, without, up, thereof, during, concerning*, of which *down* and *concerning* are virtually non-existent in UK legal English. The overrepresentation of *concerning* may be attributed to its use in names of EU instruments, e.g. *Directive 93/42/EEC concerning medical devices*, where UK English prefers more synthetic non-prepositional premodification, e.g. *Medical Devices Regulation*. In many cases the overrepresentation of a simple preposition is linked to the overrepresentation of a related complex preposition, e.g. *with* → *in accordance with, with a view to*, or to a repetitive pattern, e.g. *comply with the requirements/provisions of this Directive, Text with EEA relevance, measures provided for in X*. A few prepositions have a similar frequency – namely, *to, by, at*, while a few of them are underrepresented in the Eurolect, that is *under, after* and *before*. The most striking difference is the strong use of *under* in UK legal English – mainly in textual mapping patterns, such as *an order under subsection (1), a leave to appeal under section 183* – as a result of which *under* is three times more frequent than in the Eurolect and nine times than in general English.

Compared to general English, the prepositions *for, by, under, and within* are overrepresented in the UK legal corpus, and, thus, may be regarded as a distinctive feature of UK legal English. Prepositions typical of the Eurolect include *under, down, within, concerning*.

The use of **compound prepositions**, that is combinations of *here* and *there* with a preposition, is often regarded as a distinctive feature of legalese (cf. Mellinkoff 1963: 13; Crystal/Davy 1969: 207–208; Mattila 2006: 244). As observed by Crystal and Davy (1969), compound prepositions have a referencing function – they are used for exact references to the instru-

⁵ Prepositions that are overrepresented have been bolded in the tables.

ment, its sections and parties to the instrument; however, this use is evaluated as excessive and ritualistic: “it seems possible to see in the almost ritualistic repetitiveness more than a little reverence for tradition” (Crystal/Davy 1969: 208). Table 3 shows the most frequent compound prepositions.

Tab. 3: Frequency of compound prepositions in legal and nonlegal English (normalised to 1 million words)

	UK Legislation BoLC	EU Legislation EN Acquis		General English BNC
		EU Regulations	EU Directives	
<i>hereby</i>	8	281	133	3
<i>hereinafter</i>	1	130	56	1
<i>hereto</i>	0	135	19	1
<i>hereafter</i>	0	10	7	1
Total:	9	556	215	6
<i>thereto</i>	6	89	58	2
<i>thereof</i>	4	867	638	5
<i>thereafter</i>	3	37	30	14
<i>thereby</i>	2	31	30	27
<i>thereon</i>	1	14	9	1
<i>therein</i>	1	59	42	3
<i>therefor</i>	0	30	8	0
Total:	17	1,127	815	52

Compound prepositions have been found to be virtually non-existent in the UK legal corpus and in general English (except for *thereby*); however, they are quite common in the English Eurolect, at least compared to UK English. This impression is mainly created by a very high frequency of *thereof*, that is 867 occurrences per million words in regulations. Its salience results from its use in highly repetitive text-forming patterns, e.g. *Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 308 thereof*, which is part of the template of EU instruments in preambles (citations), or *The Member States shall bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this Directive no later than 31 January 2006. They shall forthwith inform the Commission thereof*, which appears in the implementation section of enacting terms in directives. The remaining compounds are far less common. Combinations with *here* that have a marked frequency include *hereby*, *hereinafter* and *hereto*, while significant combinations with *there* include *thereof*, *thereto* and *therein*. The performative *hereby* is mainly used in amending clauses (*X is hereby amended/repeated/replaced*). Overall, compounds with *there* are at least twice as frequent as compounds with *here* in the Eurolect. In respect of the internal variation of the Eurolect, regulations use compound prepositions more often than directives do.

The final group covers **complex prepositions**. Let us now verify their distribution in legal against general English. Table 4 shows the most frequent complex prepositions (arranged according to their frequency in UK legislation) identified through concordances of simple pre-

positions. The table includes only such complex prepositions which appear more than 50 times per million words in either the UK legislation or the Eurolect corpora.⁶

Tab. 4: Frequency of complex prepositions in legal and nonlegal English (normalised to 1 million words)

	UK Legisla- tion BoLC	EU Legislation EN Acquis		General English BNC
		Regulations	Directives	
<i>in relation to</i>	1,654	104	166	47
<i>for (the) purpose(s) of</i>	1,179	484	487	21
<i>in respect of</i>	928	513	396	30
<i>subject to</i>	862	495	506	53
<i>by virtue of</i>	693	48	31	10
<i>in accordance with</i>	631	1,896	2,003	21
<i>relating to</i>	464	359	757	32
<i>in the case of</i>	357	460	725	47
<i>in connection with</i>	326	62	38	16
<i>other than</i>	268	425	405	45
<i>within the meaning of</i>	212	189	173	2
<i>in pursuance of</i>	189	9	12	1
<i>for a period of</i>	153	57	46	3
<i>with respect to</i>	153	45	88	14
<i>beginning with</i>	153	2	1	4
<i>on behalf of</i>	149	55	49	27
<i>at the end of</i>	100	55	65	95
<i>as a result of</i>	96	86	70	52
<i>by reference to</i>	96	37	23	7
<i>apart from</i>	78	12	14	65
<i>by reason of</i>	75	30	25	3
<i>by way of</i>	72	103	99	14
<i>in consequence of</i>	65	2	2	1
<i>at the time of</i>	61	71	94	28
<i>in the course of</i>	54	41	34	19

⁶ Examples of complex prepositions with a normalised frequency below 50 occurrences in UK legislation and/or EU legislation (Acquis): *instead of* (BoLC 38, R-Acquis 23, L-Acquis 28, BNC 72), *because of* (26, 45, 44, 179), *on account of* (14, 15, 11, 5), *on (the) ground(s) of* (10, 11, 24, 8), *in charge of* (9, 5, 11, 17), *contrary to* (8, 15, 16, 13), *irrespective of* (5, 29, 25, 9), *regardless of* (3, 16, 21, 14), *within the scope of* (3, 27, 34, 2), *along with* (3, 5, 4, 50), *depending on* (2, 34, 46, 23), *with reference to* (1, 9, 13, 4), *in line with* (1, 47, 26, 13), *for reasons of* (1, 22, 24, 2), *at the expense of* (1, 6, 1, 11), *in agreement with* (0, 38, 7, 2), *owing to* (0, 14, 22, 8), *in front of* (0, 3, 16, 62), *in the range of* (0, 2, 33, 2).

<i>with a view to</i>	51	128	135	8
<i>as far as</i>	46	53	94	58
<i>by means of</i>	43	84	175	16
<i>without prejudice to</i>	42	189	284	1
<i>pursuant to</i>	41	607	394	4
<i>together with</i>	35	94	131	59
<i>as regards</i>	34	364	234	7
<i>in order to</i>	30	603	630	123
<i>in addition to</i>	26	58	102	35
<i>related to</i>	23	95	97	46
<i>as from</i>	21	63	59	5
<i>due to</i>	19	106	101	107
<i>in response to</i>	16	76	7	20
<i>from the date of</i>	15	72	44	2
<i>in case of</i>	15	45	51	3
<i>according to</i>	14	314	429	158
<i>with effect from</i>	11	77	79	2
<i>with regard to</i>	11	163	234	17
<i>in the form of</i>	10	211	70	28
<i>in (the) absence of</i>	10	80	54	16
<i>in compliance with</i>	10	59	41	1
<i>except for</i>	10	53	51	19
<i>in the event of</i>	9	95	160	11
<i>on the basis of</i>	7	473	295	30
<i>prior to</i>	7	80	126	32
<i>in (the) light of</i>	6	122	113	18
<i>in terms of</i>	5	73	44	102
<i>in conformity with</i>	3	36	82	1
<i>in the context of</i>	3	55	44	20
<i>on the occasion of</i>	2	3	113	1
<i>in view of</i>	2	124	50	15
<i>with (the) exception of</i>	1	95	90	8
<i>on the day of</i>	1	87	40	3
<i>in/within the framework of</i>	0	93	53	2
<i>in/within the territory of</i>	0	65	75	0.5

The table shows marked differences in the frequency of complex prepositions. In contrast to simple prepositions, complex prepositions listed in table 4 have an overall similar frequency in both the Eurolect and UK legal English (around 10,400 occurrences per million words), which is ca. 6.5 times higher than their frequency in general English. However, there are significant differences at the level of individual prepositions.

Unlike simple prepositions, top 5 complex prepositions are far from being identical across the corpora and due to their high frequency contribute to distinct phraseological profiles:

- UK legislation *in relation to, for (the) purpose(s) of, in respect of, subject to, by virtue of*
- EU legislation (Regulations) *in accordance with, pursuant to, in order to, in respect of, subject to*
- EU legislation (Directives) *in accordance with, relating to, in the case of, in order to, subject to*
- General English *because of, according to, in order to, due to, in terms of*

Legal corpora share *subject to* and *in respect of* while general English and EU English share *in order to*, which is rare in UK legislation.

While legal corpora, in particular EU ones, prefer *in accordance with*, BNC shows strong preference for synonymous *according to*, which is very rare in UK legislation. With the frequency of around 2000 occurrences per million words, *in accordance with* is the most common preposition in EU English. For comparison, its frequency in BNC is 21 occurrences per million words. It is also extremely common in the English Eurolect compared to other complex prepositions, the next top ones ranging around 400–700 occurrences per million words (*in the case of, in order to, pursuant to, in respect of, subject to, for (the) purpose(s) of, on the basis of, relating to, according to, other than*).

UK legal English shows different preferences. The most frequent preposition is *in relation to* (1,654 occurrences per million words), which is ten times less common in the Eurolect. Other top prepositions include *for (the) purpose(s) of, in respect of, subject to, by virtue of, in accordance with* (which however is three times less common than in the Eurolect), *relating to*. The group of 100–400 occurrences includes *in the case of, in connection with, within the meaning of, in pursuance of, beginning with, for a period of, with respect to, on behalf of*. Most of these prepositions have a markedly lower frequency in the Eurolect, which might indicate non-native influences (either by translators or drafters). Interestingly, while UK legal English prefers *in pursuance of*, which is non-existent in the Eurolect, EU English prefers synonymous *pursuant to*, which is very rare in UK legal English. Other signs of non-native influences on the Eurolect are attested by the fact that quite a few prepositions which rank high in the Eurolect have such an insignificant frequency in UK national English that it is even lower than in general English. They include: *in order to, on the basis of, according to, in the form of, in view of, in (the) light of, with regard to, due to, in the event of, related to, with (the) exception of, together with, prior to, in (the) absence to, in terms of, in addition to, except for*. The comparison with Pontrandolfo's study (2013) of complex prepositions in UK criminal judgments in the COSPE corpus of 2 million words shows that the frequency of prepositions in UK judgments is significantly lower than in UK legislation; however, quite a few top prepositions are shared with UK legislation (*in relation to, in respect of, on behalf of, for (the) purposes of, in accordance with, by reference to*), far more than with EU English. Certain prepositions are unique to judgments

and are very rare in UK legislation (or EU legislation) – these include: *on (the) ground(s) of, in furtherance of, at the hands of, in charge of, by leave of, for reasons of*.

Compared to general English, complex prepositions are strongly overrepresented in the Eurolect. There are very few (4) complex prepositions which rank as frequent in the Eurolect and which at the same time have a frequency above 100 occurrences per million words in BNC – these are: *according to, in order to, due to, in terms of*. In respect of the table 4 complex prepositions, only *in terms of* has a higher frequency in BNC than in the Eurolect (and in UK legal English), which may be explained by the polysemous and terminological nature of the constituent ‘term’, with specific legal meanings, e.g. *terms and conditions hereof, during the term of the agreement, the following terms have the following meaning*⁷. Only *due to* has a similar frequency. The remaining prepositions may be regarded as typical of the Eurolect. The group of complex prepositions with a frequency below 50 occurrences per million words includes more units which are more common in BNC – these include *instead of, because of, in charge of, along with, in front of, in spite of, next to*.

The reason behind such a marked divergence between UK and EU English is that EU English was shaped by translation and is itself translationese. It was not until 1973 when the United Kingdom joined the European Economic Community, which was established in 1957. At the time of accession, a body of Community legislation already existed before the accession and was translated from one of the then official languages – French, Dutch, German and Italian – into English. EU English has become a *lingua franca* of the European Union – a hybrid mediated language which emerged in a multilingual environment with constant code-switching. As Robertson (2010: 6) notes, EU English may be “‘bent’ to accommodate other languages [...] which translate from it”. As a result, it is a distinct variety of English which differs from UK English. This is confirmed by an unusually high frequency of some complex prepositions in the Eurolect compared to general language: explicit/analytical *in order to, as regards*, as well as *on the basis of*.

5.2 Distribution of simple and complex prepositions in EU legal Polish, Polish national law and general Polish

As in English, **simple prepositions** dominate the top of Polish wordlists due to their non-inflected forms. Table 5 shows 14 prepositions which appear in the top 200 words of Polish legislation (16 in Polish Acquis – for comparison, 21 in English Acquis).

⁷ I owe this remark to an anonymous referee.

Tab. 5: Frequency and, where available, wordlist ranking of simple prepositions in legal and nonlegal Polish (normalised to 1 million words)

	Polish legislation PLC		EU Legislation PL Acquis				General Polish NKJP
			Regulations		Directives		
<i>w</i> (<i>we</i>) ⁸ [in]	45,273	#1	39,632	#1	38,492	#1	13,544
<i>z</i> (<i>ze</i>) [with]	20,418	#3	21,727	#2	17,234	#3	9,381
<i>o</i> [about]	17,681	#4	5,219	#14	4,400	#15	4,985
<i>do</i> [to]	15,652	#6	14,948	#4	16,081	#4	7,483
<i>na</i> [on]	13,183	#7	11,938	#5	10,538	#6	9,651
<i>przez</i> [through]	5,649	#16	3,967	#23	4,753	#12	2,505
<i>od</i> [from]	3,780	#20	3,026	#30	2,827	#26	2,969
<i>za</i> [behind]	2,872	#28	1,694	#48	1,717	#47	2,803
<i>po</i> [after]	2,063	#35	1,782	#45	1,691	#48	3,125
<i>dla</i> [for]	1,918	#37	4,035	#21	4,514	#14	2,213
<i>przed</i> [before]	1,212	#68	696	#140	1,018	#93	1,054
<i>przy</i> [at]	907	#93	836	#110	1,411	#58	1,213
<i>bez</i> [without]	588	#153	717	#134	900	#106	815
<i>pod</i> [under]	515	#178	972	#88	1,411	#77	1,095
<i>między</i> [between]	270	#393	806	#113	768	#129	439
<i>podczas</i> [during]	121	#911	332	#287	607	#164	454

Top prepositions appear nearly twice as often in legal Polish as in general Polish (NKJP); this is true for both translated EU law and national law. These differences between legal and general language are not so marked in English, where the top prepositions in Acquis are only 20 % higher than in general English. As a result, simple prepositions are very salient in legal Polish against general Polish.

Similarly to English, the top 5 prepositions are shared, but for *dla* [for] which may code purpose and hence has an increased frequency in directives:

- PL legislation *w, z, do, o, na*
- EU legislation (Regulations) *w, z, do, na, o*
- EU legislation (Directives) *w, z, do, na, dla*
- General Polish *w, z, na, do, o*

There are some marked differences in the distribution of prepositions across the corpora. The comparison of legal Polish to general Polish shows that the majority of the top ranking prepositions are overrepresented in both the Eurolect and national legal Polish, i.e. *w* [in], *z* [with], *do* [to], *przez* [by], except for lower-ranking prepositions *na* [on], *od* [from], *przy* [at], *przed* [before], which have a similar frequency, and *po* [after], which is underrepresented in legal

⁸ The *w* and *z* prepositions have contextual variants, *we* and *ze*, if they are followed by a fricative consonant.

Polish. There is also some variation within legal Polish. The comparison of the Eurolect to nontranslated national legal Polish shows:

- Keywords (strong overrepresentation) in EU law: *pod* [under], *między* [between], *podczas* [during] and *dla* [for] (the latter may result from interference from English).
- Keywords (strong overrepresentation) in national legal Polish: *o* [about], *na* [on], *przez* [through], *za* [behind], *nad* [above]. The first preposition *o* [about] is ca. 3.5 times more frequent in national legal Polish than in the Eurolect and general Polish as a result of its use in the highly-repetitive referential formula *o którym mowa w art. X* [which is referred to in Article X] and in titles of legislative instruments (e.g. *ustawa o rachunkowości* [the act about accounting]). The latter is also responsible for the strong overrepresentation of *concerning* in EU English, its literal equivalent *dotyczący* and the complex preposition *w sprawie* [in the matter of] in EU Polish, which has developed distinct naming patterns.

It may be concluded that the unusually high frequency of simple prepositions in legal language is often linked to their use in salient referencing formulas. It applies to the English *under* and to the Polish *o* and *w/we*, which collocate mainly with editing units, e.g. *Article* (cf. Biel 2014b).

Table 6 shows the frequency of **complex prepositions** extracted by examining concordances of simple prepositions. It includes complex prepositions with a normalised frequency of more than 50 times per million words in Polish or EU legislation (arranged according to the PLC corpus).

Tab. 6: Frequency of complex prepositions in legal and nonlegal Polish (normalised to 1 million words)

	Polish legislation PLC	EU Legislation PL Acquis		General Polish NKJP
		Regulations	Directives	
<i>do spraw</i> [in charge of]	2,077	11	12	69
<i>w przypadku</i> [in the case of]	2,008	1,738	2,196	213
<i>na podstawie</i> [on the basis of]	1,730	983	723	138
<i>w zakresie</i> [in respect of]	1,661	647	764	118
<i>w drodze</i> [by way of]	1,514	186	160	65
<i>w terminie</i> [within the time limit of]	1,137	246	175	35
<i>w razie</i> [in the case of]	755	113	219	61
<i>w celu</i> [in order to; for the purpose of]	693	1,464	1,936	84
<i>zgodnie z</i> [according to]	688	2,722	3,155	204
<i>w sprawie</i> [in the matter of]	636	1,536	1,128	213
<i>w rozumieniu</i> [within the understanding of]	616	216	243	17
<i>z tytułu</i> [for; BT ⁹ under the title of]	581	220	124	60

⁹ BT – back translation.

<i>na terytorium</i> [in the territory of]	572	134	184	14
<i>z zastrzeżeniem</i> [subject to; BT with reservations as to]	501	121	158	12
<i>wraz z</i> [together with]	418	199	238	177
<i>w wysokości</i> [in the amount of]	370	181	26	66
<i>w związku z</i> [in connection with]	364	325	247	173
<i>w ramach</i> [within the framework of]	352	943	401	159
<i>w okresie</i> [within the period of]	352	391	148	88
<i>w trybie</i> [under; BT in the manner of]	346	21	18	30
<i>na rzecz</i> [for; in favour of]	336	170	89	96
<i>ze względu na</i> [in respect of]	327	175	190	117
<i>w formie</i> [in the form of]	324	220	156	50
<i>z wyjątkiem</i> [with the exception of]	283	408	403	26
<i>w stosunku do</i> [in relation to]	282	190	247	82
<i>w porozumieniu z</i> [in agreement with]	261	18	14	10
<i>w wyniku</i> [as a result of]	257	196	181	82
<i>z uwzględnieniem</i> [in consideration of]	256	113	119	12
<i>w odniesieniu do</i> [with reference to]	243	1,674	1,244	33
<i>w czasie</i> [at the time of]	235	150	217	202
<i>w ciągu</i> [in the course of]	231	278	253	180
<i>z zakresu</i> [in the scope of]	229	32	59	30
<i>z wyłączeniem</i> [with the exclusion of]	203	234	72	7
<i>do czasu</i> [by the time of]	193	58	130	53
<i>co do</i> [as to]	170	54	71	135
<i>na okres</i> [for a period of]	162	120	41	15
<i>w toku</i> [in the course of]	162	20	12	26
<i>przez okres</i> [for a period of]	161	89	99	7
<i>przed upływem</i> [before the lapse of]	137	31	30	6
<i>na terenie</i> [in the area of]	134	43	56	104
<i>z powodu</i> [for a reason of]	129	89	75	102
<i>w wypadku</i> [in the event of]	114	24	23	30

<i>za pośrednictwem</i> [via; BT through the mediation of]	108	48	42	36
<i>z mocy</i> [under; BT by power of]	108	7	5	8
<i>w imieniu</i> [on behalf of]	104	661	368	71
<i>w trakcie</i> [during the course of]	99	162	172	113
<i>z chwilą</i> [upon; BT at the moment of]	98	30	24	12
<i>za okres</i> [for a period of]	87	16	0	6
<i>za pomocą</i> [with the help of]	78	143	312	79
<i>niezależnie od</i> [irrespective of]	76	77	115	49
<i>do celów</i> [for the purposes of]	72	468	587	8
<i>w postaci</i> [in the form of]	70	177	122	67
<i>w zależności od</i> [depending on]	64	145	137	43
<i>bez względu na</i> [regardless of]	63	57	75	32
<i>na skutek</i> [as a result of]	62	24	29	31
<i>pod rygorem</i> [under the pain of]	59	1	0	2
<i>niezgodnie z</i> [contrary to]	58	4	4	6
<i>w dziedzinie</i> [in the area of]	57	74	192	31
<i>na mocy</i> [pursuant to/BT: by power of article]	47	595	435	17
<i>łącznie z</i> [inclusive of]	45	133	197	20
<i>przy pomocy</i> [with the help of]	44	31	69	23
<i>w miarę</i> [in line with]	42	61	165	~34
<i>przy użyciu</i> [with the use of]	37	78	128	13
<i>pod względem</i> [in respect of]	37	63	87	45
<i>w oparciu o</i> [on the basis of]	31	113	95	27
<i>począwszy od</i> [beginning with]	24	68	44	15
<i>z uwagi na</i> [in view of]	22	89	59	26
<i>na temat</i> [on the subject of]	18	147	201	164
<i>na zasadzie</i> [on the principle of]	16	68	75	20
<i>włącznie z</i> [inclusive of]	10	146	98	4
<i>odnośnie do</i> [with regard to]	10	122	98	9
<i>ze strony</i> [on behalf of]	8	55	32	76
<i>w świetle</i> [in light of]	5	119	126	26
<i>bez uszczerbku dla</i> [without prejudice to]	3	172	266	1
<i>ds.</i> [in charge of – abbrev.]	2	632	371	56
<i>na baize</i> [on the basis of]	2	86	74	11

In contrast to English which prefers three-word prepositions, Polish shows a strong preference for two-word ones. As for top 5 prepositions in each corpus, they sharply differ across the corpora:

- PL legislation *do spraw, w przypadku, na podstawie, w zakresie, w drodze*
- EU legislation (Regulations) *zgodnie z, w przypadku, w odniesieniu do, w sprawie, w celu*
- EU legislation (Directives) *zgodnie z, w przypadku, w celu, w odniesieniu do, w sprawie*
- General Polish *w przypadku, w sprawie, zgodnie z, w czasie, w ciągu*

The top 5 prepositions are identical for the regulations and directives subcorpora of EU legislation (except for the higher ranking of *w celu* [for the purpose of], which is natural in purpose-oriented directives), which is not the case with the corresponding EU English instruments.

The overall distribution of complex prepositions in Polish resembles that in English: namely, complex prepositions appear nearly as frequently in the Eurolect as in national legislation and are ca. 5.3 times more frequent than in general Polish. However, the number and frequency of complex prepositions are substantially higher in legal Polish (~22,000) than in legal English (~10,400), which also applies to general Polish compared to general English. Thus, complex prepositions are more cognitively salient in legal Polish than in English. The reason for this is the predilection of Polish for analytical structures where English prefers more synthetic patterns. The prolific use of complex prepositions in legal Polish may have been intensified by the significant growth of such prepositions in the 20th-century general Polish associated with the increasing analyticity of Polish (cf. Łapa 2006: 358, Milewska 2003: 9). The second reason is the ability of complex prepositions to trigger nominalisations and a strong preference of Polish for the nominal style in formal registers. Although legal English is typically described as favouring the nominal style, from the perspective of Polish it is much more verbal with a greater depth of hypotactic embeddings.

As shown in table 6, Polish national legislation and EU legislation are profiled by a different set of salient prepositions. As in the case of the English Eurolect, its Polish version has developed preferences for some complex prepositions which differ from those preferred by national legislation. The most frequent prepositions include *zgodnie z* [according to], *w przypadku* [in the case of], *w odniesieniu do* [with reference to], *w sprawie* [in the matter of], *w celu* [for the purpose(s) of], *na podstawie* [on the basis of], *w ramach* [within the framework of]. The first two are identical in both language versions: *zgodnie z* – *in accordance with* and *w przypadku* – *in the case of*. Some prepositions are strongly overrepresented in the Eurolect: *zgodnie z* [according to], *w odniesieniu do* [with reference to], *na mocy* [pursuant to], *bez uszczerbku dla* [without prejudice to]: they reflect the frequency of corresponding English pronouns in English Acquis. Some prepositions which are frequent in the Eurolect are hardly ever used in legal Polish; they include the abbreviation *ds.* [in charge of], *bez uszczerbku dla* [without prejudice to], *włącznie z* [inclusive of], *odnośnie do* [with regard to], *w świetle* [in light of]. This may be explained by interference from English and translators' preference for literal translation strategies when dealing with multilingual law, e. g. *without prejudice to* → *bez uszczerbku dla*, hardly ever used in Polish. Some prepositions are rarely prompted in translation (the Eurolect)

despite their prominence in legal Polish, e. g. *w trybie* [under], *w wypadku* [in the event of], *w porozumieniu z* [in agreement with], *w toku* [in the course of], or are strongly underrepresented, e. g. *na podstawie* [on the basis of], *w zakresie* [in respect of], *w terminie* [within the time limit], *z tytułu* [under the title of], *w rozumieniu* [within the meaning of], *w drodze* [by way of], *na rzecz* [in favour of]. They are good candidates for unique items¹⁰ which are not prompted in translations and suggest translators' low awareness of legal target-language conventions. Compared to general Polish, the majority of prepositions are overrepresented in both legal corpora.

In addition to frequency distortions due to interference, the Eurolect shows an increased variation of complex prepositions, including some atypical (distorted) forms and constituent variation, e. g. *z wyjątkiem* [with the exception of] and the stigmatised form *za wyjątkiem*, or *odnośnie do* [relating to] and incorrect use without *do*.

The above analysis provides empirical quantitative data on the frequency of complex prepositions. It confirms that complex prepositions are very frequent and cognitively salient in legislation. It also demonstrates that the (sub-)genres of national and multilingual legislation have developed distinct phraseological profiles as regards complex prepositions. The next section accounts for the predilection of legal discourse for complex prepositions by analysing their functions.

6 Functions of complex prepositions in legislation

Prepositions are polysemous and multi-functional; for example, the Polish preposition *w* [in] has as many as 50 senses (cf. Milewska 2003: 43). Prepositions encode spatial relations or their metaphorical extensions which are “figuratively derived from notions of physical space” (Greenbaum/Quirk 1990: 191), including time, cause, reason, motive, purpose, means, instrument, agency, stimulus, accompaniment, concession (Greenbaum/Quirk 1990: 191–202).

In contrast to everyday language, the prototypical function of prepositions – that is expression of spatial relations – is rarely utilised in legislation, except for *na terytorium* [in the territory of], *na terenie* [in the area of] and EU English *in/within the territory of*. The vast majority of uses of complex prepositions derives from metaphorical extensions of spatial relations into abstract concepts in which law abounds. In particular, the analysis of concordances with complex prepositions shows that their high frequency is linked to their important local and global functions in the formulation of legal rules. A typical legal sentence has an if-then structure, linking a set of legal conditions with legal effects (Kjær 2000: 146) and specifying circumstances in which a rule applies, or qualifications of legal rules in Bhatia's terms (1994). Complex prepositions are one of the main devices to introduce such qualifications. Structurally – in addition to conjunctions, subordinators and participles – prepositional phrases chunk a legal rule into smaller segments. Below is a list of major functions identified in the corpora.

- **Conditionals and hypothetical patterns**

EN: *in the case of, in the event of, in case of, in (the) absence of*

PL: *w przypadku, w razie, w wypadku, pod warunkiem*

¹⁰ The underrepresentation of unique items is hypothesised to be a distinctive feature of translations, which contributes to a divergent textual fit of translations to nontranslated texts of a corresponding genre. Unique items are TL features without straightforward counterparts in the SL and “they do not readily suggest themselves as translation equivalents, as there is no obvious linguistic stimulus for them in the source text” (Tirkkonen-Condit 2004: 177–178).

Not all patterns that realise the *if-then* mental model are explicitly marked as conditionals and have the *if-then* prototypical form (cf. Salmi-Tolonen 1994: 18). They may function as preparatory qualifications which specify conditions under which a rule applies (cf. Bhatia 1994: 154).

- **Referencing patterns (text deixis): legal authority and conflict avoidance/resolution**

EN: *in accordance with, pursuant to, subject to, on the basis of, according to, without prejudice to, in connection with, in compliance with, in conformity with, by virtue of, in pursuance of, by reference to, in line with, contrary to, by derogation from, within the meaning of*

PL: *zgodnie z, na podstawie, na mocy, bez uszczerbku dla, w trybie, z mocy, niezgodnie z, w rozumieniu*

This is a very productive group, more varied in English, and a prominent function linked to the condensation of information. They function as text deixis referring to specific places in the same or related statute. As observed by Mattila (2006: 78), legal texts behave as a “non-linear ‘hypertext’ weighed down with a large number of references” which function as shortcuts. References may be intratextual (within the document) or intertextual (to external instruments). References to editing units (e.g. articles) with complex prepositions are least salient in the Polish national legislation due to the high-frequency non-finite clause *o którym mowa w* [which (is) referred to in], which appears as many as 7,815 times per million words (743 in regulations and 436 in directives). Although the frequency of such references with complex prepositions is similar in Polish legislation and UK legislation, they constitute only 12 % of the analysed complex prepositions in the former, and as many as 30 % in the latter. Similarly, such references constitute ca. 20 % of complex prepositions in the Polish version of EU legislation and as many as 35 % in the English version of EU legislation (although their frequency is similar and higher than in national legislation). This indicates that complex prepositions to a large degree realise a referencing function in English while in Polish this function is less prominent.

As regards their function, references may be divided into those which establish legal authority (*pursuant to*), signal lack of conflict (*in accordance with*) or resolve conflicts (*without prejudice to*) (cf. Biel 2014b).

- **Anchoring and particularisation**

EN: *in respect of, as regards, relating to, with regard to, in view of, in light of, in relation to, related to, in terms of, with respect to*

PL: *w odniesieniu do, w sprawie, w ramach, w zakresie, w stosunku do, na temat, odnośnie do, do spraw, co do, w dziedzinie*

This is a very salient high-frequency category of prepositions which have an anchoring (focusing) function whereby they narrow down the scope of legal rule, especially when they appear in sentence initial position, e.g. *In respect of a computer program created by a group of natural persons jointly, the exclusive rights shall be owned jointly*. A subtype of this category is referred to by Bhatia as “preparatory qualifications” (1994: 151); they contain “the pre-positioning of the case description” to limit the universal application of the rule (1994: 146). They may also have a local function of particularisation: *no Member State may, on grounds relating to air pollution by their*

emissions: refuse to grant EEC type-approval. Such anchoring and framing increase the precision of regulation.

- **Time deixis**

EN: *for a period of, from the date of, prior to, beginning with, on the occasion of*

PL: *w okresie, przez okres, na okres, do czasu, z chwilą, za okres, w ciągu, w czasie, w terminie, począwszy od, w toku, w trakcie*

This is a varied, frequent and prominent group in legislation (see also Goźdź-Roszkowski 2011: 120) due to the need to specify duration or time limits of rights or obligations.

- **Participative patterns**

EN: *on behalf of, in charge of, in the range of, together with*

PL: *w imieniu, na rzecz, w porozumieniu z, przy pomocy*

This group has a more local function of setting the scene in a legal rule by introducing participants of legal rules.

- **Purpose**

EN: *for the purpose(s) of, in order to, with a view to*

PL: *w celu, do celów*

The salience of this group is connected with the purposive function of law whereby it aims at achieving a certain end (cf. Salmi-Tolonen 1994: 29). For Bhatia purposive patterns are operational qualifications under which the rule of law applies (cf. 1994: 154). Purposive patterns are strongly overrepresented in the Eurolect, especially in directives which specify the purpose to be achieved by the Member States.

- **Means, instrument**

EN: *by means of, by way of*

PL: *w drodze, przy użyciu, za pośrednictwem, za pomocą, na zasadzie, w formie, w postaci*

These prepositions have a local function of clarifying means or instruments of action.

- **Cause, effect, reason**

EN: *due to, as a result of, by reason of, because of, owing to*

PL: *z powodu, w wyniku, na skutek, ze względu na, z tytułu, w związku z, z uwagi na, pod rygorem, bez względu na*

This is another type of framing which may introduce causal-resultative scripts and permission. It is quite a varied and frequent group compared to everyday language.

- **Inclusion and exclusion**

EN: *with (the) exception of, except for, apart from, together with*

PL: *z wyjątkiem, z wyłączeniem, wraz z, łącznie z, włącznie z*

This group covers prepositions which include or exclude from a set, thus extending or narrowing the scope of regulation. Compared to everyday language, this group of prepositions has increased distribution in legislation.

To sum up, the phraseological profiles of legislative instruments are marked by the high frequency and resulting cognitive salience of complex prepositions which are used in referencing patterns (authority, conflict), conditionals, anchoring (framing) patterns, defining patterns and time deixis.

Conclusions

The use of complex prepositions is language- and genre-specific and therefore it might have been reasonably expected to remain stable within the genre of legislation. Yet, despite some similarities in the overall increased frequency of complex prepositions in legal language against general language, their frequency significantly differs between EU variants and national variants of legal languages, both in English and Polish, contributing to distinct phraseological profiles of these variants. One of the reasons is that EU law has emerged from translator-mediated communicative events which are subject to interference and other distortions typical of the translation process and multilingual processing. In the case of Polish, the EU texts reflect underlying English (or other) originals; in the case of English, the EU texts reflect adjustments for the purposes of multilingual translation and the influence of non-native drafters and other official languages (“fusion”, “osmosis”) due to constant code-switching. Another factor is the sacrosanct – literal – approach to translating multilingual legislation which is naively believed to ensure the uniform interpretation and application of EU law across the Member States. It is important to point out that while some divergences between the language of EU law and national law are fully justified, especially at the terminological level, to differentiate between the concepts of EU law and national law, this is not the case with prepositional phrases which should be adopted to target-language conventions to facilitate text processing to readers. Such departures from target-language conventions may reduce the readability and clarity to the reader. In general, the unconventional use of phraseological patterns sends weaker signals of being “in a genre” and increases processing effort by breaking away from the routine (cf. Biel 2014b: 190). Clearly, more attention should be paid to raise EU translators’ awareness of natural TL patterns to avoid unnecessary departures from established generic conventions.

References

- Alcaraz, Enrique/Hughes, Brian (2002): *Legal Translation Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Baker, Paul (2010): *Sociolinguistics and Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bhatia, Vijay K. (1994): “Cognitive structuring in legislative provisions.” *Language and the Law*. Ed. John Gibbons. New York: Longman. 136–155.
- Biber, Douglas/Johansson, Stig/Leech, Geoffrey/Conrad, Susan/Finegan, Edward (2007): *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Biel, Łucja (2014a): *Lost in the Eurofog. The Textual Fit of Translated Law*. Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang.
- Biel, Łucja (2014b): “Phraseology in Legal Translation: a Corpus-based Analysis of Textual Mapping in EU Law.” *Ashgate Handbook of Legal Translation*. Eds. Le Cheng/King Kui Sin/Anne Wagner. Aldershot: Ashgate. 177–192.
- Charrow, Robert P./Charrow Veda R. (1979): “Making Legal Language Understandable: A Psycholinguistic Study of Jury Instructions.” *Columbia Law Review* 79.7: 1306–1374.
- Crystal, David/Davy, Derek (1969): *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman.
- Coulthard, Malcolm/Johnson, Alison (2007): *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics. Language in Evidence*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Garner, Bryan A. (2002): *The Elements of Legal Style*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goźdz-Roszkowski, Stanisław (2011): *Patterns of Linguistic Variation in American Legal English. A Corpus-Based Study*. Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang.

- Granger, Sylviane/Paquot, Magali (2008): "Disentangling the phraseological web." *Phraseology. An interdisciplinary perspective*. Eds. Sylviane Granger/Fanny Meunier. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 27–49.
- Greenbaum, Sidney/Quirk, Randolph (1990): *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Huddleston, Rodney (1986): *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, Alison/Coulthard, Malcolm (2010): "Current debates in forensic linguistics." *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. Eds. Malcolm Coulthard/Alison Johnson. London/New York: Routledge. 1–15.
- Kjær, Anne Lise (1990): "Context-conditioned word combinations in legal language." *Journal of the International Institute for Terminology Research* 1.1–2: 21–32.
- Kjær, Anne Lise (2000): "On the structure of legal knowledge: The importance of knowing legal rules for understanding legal texts." *Language, Text, and Knowledge. Mental Models of Expert Communication*. Eds. Lita Lundquist/Robert J. Jarvella. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. 127–161.
- Łapa, Romana (2006): "Przymyki wtórne w tekstach prawnych." *Język Polski* 86.5: 358–366.
- Mattila, Heikki E.S. (2006): *Comparative Legal Linguistics*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mellinkoff, David (1963): *The Language of the Law*. Eugene: Resource Publications.
- Milewska, Beata (2003): *Przymyki wtórne we współczesnej polszczyźnie*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Pontrandolfo, Gianluca (2013): *La fraseología en las sentencias penales: un estudio contrastivo español, italiano, inglés basado en corpus*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Trieste. 23.04.2015 <<http://www.openstarts.units.it/xmlui/handle/10077/8590>>.
- Quirk, Randolph/Greenbaum, Sidney/Leech, Geoffrey/Svartvik, Jan (1985): *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Robertson, Colin (2010): "LSP and EU Legal Language." *Reconceptualizing LSP. Online proceedings of the XVII European LSP Symposium 2009*. Eds. Carmen Heine/Jan Engberg. 01.02.2015 <<http://bcom.au.dk/fileadmin/www.asb.dk/isek/robertson.pdf>>.
- Salmi-Tolonen, Tarja (1994): "The linguistic manifestations of primary and secondary functions of law in the national and supranational contexts." *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 7.19: 13–39.
- Šarčević, Susan (1997): *New Approach to Legal Translation*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Schiess, Wayne (2007): "Mind your prepositions." *LegalWriting.net*. 04.02.2008 <<http://www.utexas.edu/law/faculty/wschiess/legalwriting/2008/02/mind-your-prepositions.html>>.
- Steinberger, Ralf/Pouliquen, Bruno/Widiger, Anna/Ignat, Camelia/Erjavec, Tomaž/Tufiş, Dan/Varga, Dániel (2006): "The JRC-Acquis: A multilingual aligned parallel corpus with 20+ languages." *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'2006)*. Genoa, 24.–26.05.2006. 01.02.2015 <http://langtech.jrc.it/Documents/0605_LREC_JRC-Acquis_Steinberger-et-al.pdf>.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja (2004): "Unique Items – Over- or Under-Represented in Translated Language?" *Translation Universals [:] Do They Exist?* Eds. Anna Mauranen/Pekka Kujamäki. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 177–184.

Dr. hab. Łucja Biel
University of Warsaw
Institute of Applied Linguistics
ul. Dobra 55
00-312 Warsaw, Poland
l.biel@uw.edu.pl